

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the November 2, 2005.

Claims 1 to 25 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 21 and 23 to 25 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), primarily over U.S. Patent 5,911,044 (Lo) in view of U.S. Patent 6,208,436 (Cunningham), further in view of U.S. Patent 5,678,483 (Maniwa '483), and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,581,098 (Kumpf '098). In addition, certain ones of the dependent claims were rejected further in view of one or more of the following: U.S. Patent 6,289,371 (Kumpf '371), U.S. Patent 6,168,444 (Cukor), and U.S. Patent 6,223,223 (Kumpf '223). Reconsideration and withdrawal of all of these rejections are respectfully requested.

In entering the rejection over Lo in view of Cunningham and Maniwa '483 and Kumpf '098, the Office Action conceded that all of Lo, Cunningham and Maniwa '483 failed to disclose an arrangement wherein a local computer terminal retrieves a scanner node having a suitable scan capability based on an instruction by a local computer terminal, and wherein the scan order is created in accordance with the scan capability of the retrieved scanner node. Kumpf '098 was relied on for this feature. As amended herein, however, the claims specify that the retrieved scanner node is retrieved from among a plurality of scanner nodes. Thus, as set out in the amended claims, a scanner node is retrieved from among a plurality of scanner nodes such as the plurality of scanner nodes 125(0) through 125(2) in Figure 1 of the application. In addition, the scanner node that is retrieved is a

scanner node having a suitable scan capability, such as according to the flow diagram illustrated in Figure 5 of the subject application.

As understood by Applicant, to the extent that Kumpf '098 might be read to disclose retrieval of a scanner node, Kumpf '098 shows only one scanner node such that it does not also disclose retrieval of a scanner node from among a plurality of scanner nodes. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of Lo, Cunningham, Maniwa '483 and Kumpf '098. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. O'Neill", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 108520v1